

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/791,122	03/02/2004	Edward H. Arnold	GPI-105US	2660
23122	7590 03/10/2006		EXAMINER	
RATNERPRESTIA			FANTU, YALKEW	
P O BOX 980 VALLEY FORGE, PA 19482-0980			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
111221 10102, 111 15 102 05 00			2838	
			DATE MAIL ED: 03/10/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	10/791,122	ARNOLD ET AL.		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Yalkew Fantu	2838		
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be the triangle and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDON	N. imely filed in the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
 Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>02 M</u>. This action is FINAL. Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E 	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pr			
Disposition of Claims				
4) Claim(s) <u>1-24</u> is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) <u>1-24</u> are subject to restriction and/or expressions.	vn from consideration.			
Application Papers				
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on 02 March 2004 is/are: a Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine 11.	a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected drawing(s) be held in abeyance. So ion is required if the drawing(s) is o	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). bjected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summar Paper No(s)/Mail I 5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:			

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

I. Claims 13-20, drawn to a computer readable medium, classified in class

Page 2

712, subclass 32.

II. Claims 21-24, drawn to an electronic device, classified in class 320,

subclass 157.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are directed to related. The related inventions are distinct if the inventions as claimed do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants; and the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions are mutually exclusive since the medium operates without the electronic device elements, and they are not capable of use together as one replaces the other, so that the mode of operation, software versus hardware, is different. Or the design is different for the same reason. Claims 1-12 are generic to the above, which are also related as species and will be examined with the elected invention.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and the inventions require a different field of search (see MPEP § 808.02), restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

A telephone call was made to Benjamin Lease on 3/1/6 and 3/2/6 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103 (a) of the other invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Application/Control Number: 10/791,122 Page 4

Art Unit: 2838

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Yalkew Fantu whose telephone number is (571) 272-

8928. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 7AM-4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Karl Easthom can be reached on (571) 272-1989. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KARL EASTHOM SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER